



Patent
Attorney's Docket No. 1031287-000024

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of) **MAIL STOP / AFTER FINAL**
Martin D. Ericsson et al.)
Application No.: 10/811,814) Group Art Unit: 3634
Filed: March 30, 2004) Examiner: GREGORY J STRIMBU
For: ON-DEMAND POWER-OPENING) Confirmation No.: 2852
DOOR CAPABLE OF BEING)
MANUALLY OPENED)
)

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

*OK to
enter
7/30/07
GSS*

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In response to the Advisory Action dated June 28, 2007, reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested for the following reason.

Claim 11 recites a feature not present in either of the prior art items combined to reject claim 11. That is, claim 11 recites in the final paragraph thereof that the linkage is returnable from the second position (passage-opening position) to the first position (passage-closing position) independently of the door. That feature is not present in either the admitted prior art or Speer.

That is, in the admitted prior art, the door-opening linkage and the door are interconnected, so independent movement is not possible.

In Speer, the linkage, i.e., the door-opening linkage constituted by the motor 32, cannot be moved (retracted) to the first position (passage-closing position of Fig. 2) independently of the door, because the linkage 32 relies upon a force of the door closer 36 in order to be retracted. Note that Speer's motor 32 is a single-acting motor (column 2, line 40), so it can only push the door open to the Fig. 4 position. In order